

Holyoke makes it difficult for HWP to compare its proposed project with the City of Holyoke's proposed project, for purposes of the "better adapted" statements.

Based on the foregoing argument, HWP believes that it is premature to require HWP and the City of Holyoke to file their "better adapted" statements prior to correction of the deficiencies in the applications, and acceptance of the applications for filing. HWP does not believe that granting the requested extension of time will unduly delay the proceedings in this docket.

Good cause has been shown, and the deadline for HWP and the City of Holyoke to file their "better adapted" statements is extended to June 30, 1998.<sup>1</sup> As noted in the Commission's October 27, 1997, Notice Granting Extension of Time to File Comments and Requests for Additional Studies, any further requests for extension of deadlines that effect the schedule of these proceedings will be given careful scrutiny.

**David P. Boergers,**  
*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98-8371 Filed 3-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP98-108-001]

#### Mississippi River Transmission Corporation; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

March 25, 1998.

Take notice that on March 23, 1998, Mississippi River Transmission Corporation (MRT) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1, the following revised tariff sheets to be effective April 1, 1998:

Third Revised Sheet No. 197  
Third Revised Sheet No. 198  
Third Revised Sheet No. 200  
Original Sheet No. 200A

MRT states that the purpose of this filing is to comply with the Commission's letter order in this docket issued March 12, 1998.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,

888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be filed as provided in Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not served to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

**Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,**

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98-8327 Filed 3-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 2645-029]

#### Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation; Notice Denying Late Intervention, and Dismissing Requests to Supplement Record and for Further Consideration

March 26, 1998.

By order issued April 2, 1996, the Commission approved a settlement agreement and issued a new license to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (Niagara Mohawk) for the continued operation of the Beaver River in Lewis and Herkimer Counties, New York.<sup>1</sup> On January 16, 1998, the Commission issued an order granting in part and denying in part certain requests for rehearing of the April 2, 1996 order.<sup>2</sup>

On February 17, 1998, the Town of Croghan, New York, filed an untimely motion to intervene and to supplement the record, and a request for consideration under Section 10(h) of the Federal Power Act,<sup>3</sup> of Niagara Mohawk's fitness to hold the new license, in view of Niagara Mohawk's plan, filed December 1, 1997, with the New York Public Service Commission, for divesting its "non-nuclear generation assets."

In acting on a late motion to intervene, the Commission may consider whether the movant has shown good cause for the failure to file the motion within the time prescribed, and whether the movant's intervention will disrupt the proceeding.<sup>4</sup> The deadline for filing intervention in this proceeding

was April 12, 1993.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, Croghan states in its motion (at p. 2) that Niagara Mohawk has been publicly stating since October 1995 that it would sell its non-nuclear generating facilities. Therefore, Croghan has not shown sufficient reason for the lateness of its filing. Moreover, in light of the issuance of the new license and approval of the related settlement agreement, granting Croghan's request for intervention would unduly disrupt the proceeding. Accordingly, Croghan's motion for late intervention is denied, and consequently its additional requests for relief are dismissed. If, as Croghan suggests, the state divestiture proceeding results in Niagara Mohawk requesting approval to transfer its license for Project No. 2645, Croghan will have the opportunity to intervene and present its arguments in that proceeding.

This notice constitutes final agency action. Requests for rehearing by the Commission may be filed within 30 days of the date of issuance of this notice, pursuant to 18 CFR 385.713.

**David P. Boergers,**

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98-8370 Filed 3-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98-291-000]

#### Northern Natural Gas Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

March 26, 1998.

Take notice that on March 20, 1998, Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern), 1111 South 103rd Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68124-1000, filed in Docket No. CP98-291-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205, 157.212 and 157.216 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.212 and 157.216) for authorization to upgrade two existing delivery points located in Green and Rock Counties, Wisconsin, to accommodate additional natural gas deliveries to Wisconsin Gas Company (WGC), under Northern's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-401-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

<sup>1</sup> Because, in the absence of this extension, the competing applicant's would be required to file their "better adapted" statements by March 31, 1998, this notice is being issued in advance of the usual 15-day response time that would otherwise apply to a motion for extension of time.

<sup>1</sup> 76 FERC ¶61,152.

<sup>2</sup> 82 FERC ¶61,029.

<sup>3</sup> 16 U.S.C. 803(h).

<sup>4</sup> 18 CFR 385.214(d).

<sup>5</sup> 58 FR 13477 (March 11, 1993).